

REMARKS

Applicant traverses the rejections and amends claim 17 to remove an extraneous comma.

The application includes nine independent claims, all of which are rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) over Nagani. Eight of the independent claims explicitly recite evaluating (claims 1, 7, 16, and 24), formulating (17 and 22), or authenticating (25, or 26) messages that indicate that a router has become controlled by an untrusted party. Nagani fails to describe a message that includes any such indication. The Action asserts that this subject matter is described in Nagani at column 7, line 43 to column 8, line 32. This passage describes a process for deleting a node or a network from a routing table based on an OSPF message. Nagani, in the cited passage, does not teach or suggest that the OSPF message, or any other message for that matter, indicates that a router has become controlled by an untrusted party. Evaluating, formulating, or authenticating messages that indicate that a router has become controlled by an untrusted party, however, is the explicit subject matter of independent claim 1, 7, 16, and 24; 17 and 22; and 25 and 26, respectively.

Applicant therefore requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejections of independent claims 1, 7, 16, 17, 22, 24, 25, and 26. Claims 2—6 depend from claim 1 and add further limitations thereto. Claims 8—15 depend from claim 7 and add further limitations thereto. Claims 18—21 depend from claim 17 and add further limitations thereto. Claim 23 depends claim 22, and adds further limitations thereto. Therefore, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2—6, 8—15, and 18—21.

Independent claim 32 recites, among other things, code to excise from a network a functioning router that has become controlled by an untrusted party and code to verify that messages transmitted among the plurality of routers are from routers controlled by trusted parties. The Action asserts that Nagani describes this subject. The Action fails, however, to identify any specific passages in Nagani that describe the subject matter. After careful review of Nagani, Applicant submits that Nagani, in fact, utterly fails to describe code that excises routers that have become controlled by untrusted parties or code for verifying that messages are transmitted by trusted parties. Applicant therefore requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection of claim 32. If

Application No. 09/596,009
Amendment dated April 16, 2007
Reply to Office Action of January 16, 2007

Docket No.: BBNT-P01-007


the Examiner intends to maintain this rejection, Applicant requests any subsequent action identify specific passages within Nagani that set forth the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.104(c)(2).

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-1945, under Order No. BBNT-P01-007 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: April 16, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Edward A. Gordon, Esq.

Registration No.: 54,130

FISH & NEAVE IP GROUP, ROPES & GRAY
LLP

One International Place
Boston, Massachusetts 02110-2624
(617) 951-7000
(617) 951-7050 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant